2 Global Spread of English in Academia and Its Effects on Writing Instruction in Turkish Universities

Hacer Hande Uysal
Gazi University (Turkey)

This chapter examines Turkish macro-level state policies of scholarly publishing from the 1980s when publications were mainly in Turkish, to the present when Turkish has lost its significance with regulations mandating that international publications be written in English as a prerequisite for academic promotion. Second, a field study explores the influences of the state publishing policies on both Turkish and English academic writing instruction in two major universities in Ankara (one Turkish- and one English-medium), focusing on three sub-policies of language-in-education policy implementation: access, curriculum, and materials and methodology. The results indicate that despite some conflicting micro-level planning and practices with state policies, the macro-level state policy has largely influenced the academic literacy practices at these universities as more courses aimed at developing English academic writing skills and Anglo-American research traditions are offered while academic writing in Turkish is neglected. English has gained a higher status and hegemony in scientific literacy, especially in the English-medium university, yet both Turkish and English writing instruction need to improve in quality.

Keywords: global spread of English; Turkish language policy; scholarly publication; academic writing instruction

The global spread of English in academia and scholarly publishing, and its political and pedagogical consequences, have been of interest in recent scholarship (e.g., Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew, 1999, 2000; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Philipson, 2008; Swales, 1997; Tardy, 2004). The spread of English in academia as the *lingua franca* of scientific publications has caused increasing

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2017.0896.2.02

pressure on academics around the world to write in English and according to English norms. As written academic discourse in English is highly standardized and embedded in Anglo-American culture, and as Anglo-Americans are in gatekeeping positions in most international journals (Tardy, 2004), this imposition of English on scholars who are non-native speakers (NNS) of English has raised the issues of linguistic and cultural hegemony (Kaplan, 2001; Phillipson, 2006; Swales, 1997; Tardy, 2004). The diffusion of powerful cultural rhetoric, especially through academic writing instruction (Canagarajah, 1999), and the homogeneity caused by the elimination of other cultural rhetorics over time, has been a major concern (Kachru, 1995; Mauranen, 1993).

The pressures caused by the global spread of English in academia and in scholarly publications have also influenced governmental policy-making in many countries that aim to become a part of the global scientific community. However, although some studies have examined the spread of English language in state policies in local contexts (e.g., Uysal, Plakans, & Dembovskaya, 2007), research investigating the spread of English specifically in scholarly publishing policies in local contexts is limited, and research looking into the interplay between macro-level government policies of scholarly publishing and micro-level academic writing instruction is almost nonexistent. Yet, as Baldauf (2005) suggests, macro-level policies often extend to micro situations such as educational practices, but applications at this level can also be independent and different from the macro-level policies. Thus, investigations at micro level are also needed "to better understand both policy implementation and solutions of micro-policy problems" (Baldauf, 2005, p. 964).

Therefore, to fill this important gap in the literature, this study explores this global issue through the example of Turkey. The study first historically examines the macro-level state policies of scholarly publishing in Turkey. Second, as studies of language policies in practice are needed (Ramanathan, 2005; Spolsky, 2004), and education is a critical vehicle for language spread (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), the impact of the state policies on micro-level practices of academic writing instruction is also explored in two major universities in Ankara, Turkey, focusing on three sub-policies of language-in-education policy implementation—access, curriculum, and materials and methodology (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, 2005).

Historical Background

Turkish Language and Literacy Planning in General

Turkey was founded as a democratic nation-state in 1923 after the collapse of

the multinational Ottoman Empire. Due to its unique history and geopolitical location between Asia and Europe, Turkey has often faced struggles between opposing forces such as West and East, past and future, modernization and nationalism (Akarsu, 1999; Kinzer, 2001). This complexity is also reflected by unclear goals and contradictory practices in language planning and policy. For example, while English is offered as the only foreign language in most state schools, and the spread of English in education has been strongly encouraged as a means of modernization and westernization, English-medium education at secondary schools was eliminated in 1997 as it was seen as a threat to the purity and status of Turkish (Uysal et al., 2007, p. 197).

Nonetheless, the global spread of English has been strongly felt in Turkey, which has always turned its face to the West more than the East, having been the member of NATO and OECD, the Council of Europe, and OSCE, and a candidate for European Union membership (Eurydice, 2010). English became influential especially after World War II because of increasing contact and closer ties with the United States (Demircan, 1988). English was embraced to integrate Turkey with the west, to participate in international communication, and to achieve technological and economic advancement and modernization. In addition, due to the gatekeeping function of English in Turkey, internal motives such as gaining access to better education and career opportunities, higher living standards, and academic promotion also contributed to the spread of English (Dogancay-Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005).

The spread of English has also been promoted through national language-in-education planning in Turkey—an "expanding circle" context (Kachru, 1992).[1] For example, 99.95% of primary-school students and 91.94% of secondary-school students learn English as a compulsory foreign language (Tok & Arıbaş, 2008), and students start learning English in second grade. In tertiary education, the spread of English is even more strongly evident as English has increasingly become the medium of education in many universities. For example, while English-medium instruction (EMI) was offered in six universities in 1990, around 79 out of 165 universities currently offer education completely in English in all departments (100% English), or in some departments, such as Economics, Medicine, and Engineering, or through some courses in English (30% English) (ÖSYM, 2011). EMI has been a topic of hot debate for years. While some support EMI for providing opportunities for content-based learning and actual use of English (Alptekin, 1998; Bear, 1998; Sert, 2008), the majority oppose it, arguing that EMI reduces students' ability to understand concepts, leads to superficial content learning, threatens Turkish, and creates an elite class alienated from the realities of the society (e.g., Demircan, 1995; Kılıçkaya, 2006; Kırkgöz, 2005; Köksal, 2002;

Sinanoğlu, 2002) (see also Hayes & Mansour, this volume, for a related discussion of the impact of societal pressures on English-language education in Bahrain).

With respect to Turkish language and literacy planning, first, the country went through an extensive language reform to realize a new national identity, language unity and modernization between 1920 and 1930 (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1995). Ottoman—the higher diglossic variety composed of Turkish, Persian, and Arabic based on Arabic script—was abandoned, and Turkish—the lower diglossic variety—was accepted with the Latin alphabet as the national language. As a result, even the small number of people who were literate in Ottoman became illiterate overnight, and the literacy rate in Turkish was only 6% in 1923 (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998). However, due to meticulous governmental efforts, the average adult literacy rate has today increased to 88.7% (UNDP Report, 2009). Nevertheless, as literacy experiences in modern Turkish have been quite recent, Turkish literacy education still has serious problems, especially in regard to writing (Ayyıldız & Bozkurt, 2006; Göçer, 2010).

Turkish Macro-level Scholarly Publishing Policies

In this section, state policies of scholarly publishing and factors behind these policies are discussed according to the changes in views and tendencies with regards to scientific publications in Turkey. This historical analysis is done based on published literature, regulations/laws, policy documents from the related Turkish state institutions, and Eurydice (2010) as data sources.

A Brief Historical Look at Scholarly Publishing Policies (1981-Present)

Until the 1980s, Turkish universities were basically teaching-oriented, and scholarly publishing was not a part of academic duty for many academics. However, in 1981, with the centralization and restructuring of all Turkish higher education institutions under the supervision of the Higher Education Council (HEC), principles of the Anglo-American university system in terms of education, research, and general university structure, which highlighted the importance of research and publishing, were adopted. This change gave rise to a new understanding within the long-established teaching-oriented Turkish university culture (Ak & Gülmez, 2006; Ardınç, 2007). However, in this period, publications were still mainly in Turkish and in national journals; additionally, many publications lacked proper citations, which often resulted in plagiarism (Ardınç, 2007; Pazarlıoğlu & Özkoç, 2009).

Later, international publications started to gain momentum, especially in the disciplines of the Natural Sciences and Medicine after the 1993 economic incentive program for international publications initiated by the Turkish Scientific & Technological Research Council (TUBITAK) through its sub-unit Academic Network & Information Center (ULAKBIM). This was followed by individual university's initiations of economic incentives and rewards for international publications (Arıoğlu & Girgin, 2002). These incentives never covered national publications in Turkish; thus, in a way, local and Turkish publications were discouraged. In this period, the general writing tendency was simply to translate Turkish articles into English before submitting them to international journals (Ardınç, 2007), so academic writing instruction in English was not a priority.

Between the years 1996 and 1999, international publications started to gain priority over Turkish. Overall, a 26% of increase was monitored in publications in The Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) database (Başkurt, 2007). However, the increasing quantity of the articles published in this period was negatively correlated with their quality as manifested by the decrease in citation statistics between 1993 and 1999 (Arıoğlu & Girgin, 2003). Thus, to increase the quality and standards of international publications, in 1997, TUBITAK excluded conference proceedings, reports, and opinion articles from the incentive program and limited the applications to research articles published in journals in the ISI database. This led to an increase in research articles along with a dramatic decrease in theoretical or opinion articles (Arıoğlu & Girgin, 2002, 2003). During this period, the importance of acquiring writing skills in English was understood, and ethical concerns regarding plagiarism were also raised with increasing western influence in academia (Ardınç, 2007).

With participation in the Bologna Reform Process (1999), Turkey undertook steps for integration, such as standardization, academic quality assurance, and accreditation in tertiary education in line with the European standards (HEC, 2010). These integration attempts with Europe and with the global scientific world resulted in developing new standards for academic promotion, research, and publishing. Hence, for the first time, criteria for academic promotion were established by the regulation of the Inter-University Council (IUC, 2000). With this regulation, proficiency in a foreign language and publications in journals indexed in the ISI database became mandatory requirements for associate professorship in most fields. In addition, international publications were endowed with twice as much value as national publications.

With the new publishing criteria and promotion policy of HEC, aca-

demic performance started to be associated solely with the number of international publications in the ISI database. Overall, a steep increase in international publications was observed between 1981 and 2010. While Turkey was 45th among world countries with only 439 international publications in 1980 (Ak & Gülmez, 2006), Turkey became 18th with 24,821 publications in 2008, and the total number of Turkish publications in ISI databases was 197,346 by 2010 (Akıllı et al., 2009, TUBITAK-ULAKBIM, 2011). In this period, concerns regarding the situation of Turkish as the language of science were also raised (e.g., Ergenç, 2001; Kılınç, 2001).

Academic Literacy-in-Education Practices in Turkish Universities

To explore any connections between macro-level state policies and micro-level implementations, academic literacy-in-education planning and practices in two major state universities in Ankara were investigated. The focus of research was on the three main sub-policies in language-in-education planning related to implementation—access, curriculum, and materials and methodology—due to their direct relevance to the research goals (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2005). The two universities selected represent different orientations and perspectives. Gazi University (GAZI)—a Turkish-medium university—was established in 1926 with a more traditional, nationalistic, and teaching-oriented view. It is one of the most populous universities in Turkey with more than 77,000 students. The Middle East Technical University (METU), on the other hand, was established in 1957 around a U.S.-university model with 100% English-medium education. It is a more elite and research-oriented university with around 26,000 students.

Methodology

Data Collection

The methods used included document collection and analysis, and interviews were also conducted to confirm and validate the findings. First, to understand how access and curriculum policy are impacted by the implementation of macro-level state policies, courses with an academic writing component were identified by looking at curricula in all departments in both universities and the HEC's course descriptions. Second, these courses were examined in detail based on the syllabi, textbooks, and assessment rubrics obtained from university websites or from instructors and students. Finally, to sup-

plement information derived from the documentary sources and to establish cross-validation and triangulation (Merriam, 1998), face-to-face semi-structured interviews with key informants were conducted in both universities.

The participants constituted 40 students from various departments (24 students from GAZI and 16 students from METU) who had already taken the writing/research courses in their particular university and 16 instructors (nine instructors from GAZI and seven instructors from METU) who had taught at least one course with an academic writing component in either GAZI or METU. The participants were selected on a voluntary basis through several campus visits to the Schools of Foreign Languages, English Language Teaching, and Turkish Education programs in both universities, and to the Department of Modern Languages at METU. Semi-structured interviews were chosen as a method because they provide reliable and comparable qualitative data through two-way communication (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). In the interviews, questions were asked regarding: class hours devoted to writing; genres and writing features taught; level of writing; textbooks used; main objectives; and teaching approaches and methods. Notes were taken during the interview and, when necessary, additional questions were asked later via e-mail (See Appendix 1 for interview questions).

Data Analysis

Kaplan & Baldauf's (1997; 2005) policy descriptions for access (who learns what and when), curriculum (how much time is allocated to writing instruction in the curriculum, what are the objectives of teaching/learning), and materials and methods (which materials and methodology are employed) were used as a framework of guidance in data analysis. For example, the documents were analyzed according to the amount of time allocated to teaching and practicing academic writing in classes; the course objectives were analyzed according to the writing genres covered and the level of writing done (e.g., writing paragraphs vs. research papers). The content of the course materials, rubrics, and syllabi were also analyzed according to the presence or absence of certain Anglo-American writing features, such as plagiarism, linear deductive organization, topic sentences, and cohesive markers. This analysis highlighted the western influence on academic writing instruction as well as source awareness, and the value attached to academic writing and these writing features (Krippendorff, 2004). Then, the notes taken during the interview were read to determine whether or not they confirmed the findings of the document analysis and also to understand in depth the methodology and practices used in writing classes.

Results

Access Policy

Upon examination of HEC's course descriptions and curriculum in all departments in both universities, it was found that a variety of compulsory and elective courses involving Turkish composition and research skills, as well as English academic writing, are available for students. Academic writing courses in METU and GAZI in both Turkish and English are similar at the lower undergraduate level but vary at the upper undergraduate level. Recently, some new academic writing courses have been introduced, especially at graduate level, and additional support for English academic writing (such as writing centers) has also been on the rise in both universities. The courses with an academic writing component in Turkish and English in the two universities can be seen in table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Courses with an academic writing component in GAZI and METU

Medium	**GAZI**	**METU**
Intensive English Preparatory Class (two semesters)		
English	Compulsory for the 30% English-medium programs and English majors since 1996.	Compulsory for all departments since 1961.
Undergraduate		
English	**1:** General English for two semesters (C). **1:** Advanced Reading &Writing for two semesters only for English majors (ELT) (C) **2:** General English for two semesters (C)	**1:** English for Academic Purposes I & II (EAP) for two semesters (C) since the foundation of the university. **1:** Advanced Reading &Writing for two semesters only for English majors (ELT)(C) **2:** Research Methods (C) for a semester. **3:** Advanced Writing & Research Skills (C) for English majors. **3 or 4:** Writing Term Papers (E). (*Not opened for the last 2 years*).
Turkish	**1:** Turkish I: Composition (C) or **2:** Turkish I & II **2:** Research Techniques (C) for a semester.	**1:** Turkish Written Communication or **3:** Turkish I & II (C)
Graduate		

Medium	GAZI	METU
English	Ph.D. Writing for publication course in ELT program (E) since 2011.	MA or MS Research Methods for some departments (C). Ph.D. Research Methods (C)
Turkish	Ph.D. Research Techniques (C) Academic Writing I & II (since 2011) Creative Thinking and Writing in Arts Education (E) Academic Writing in Biology (E)	
Additional Support for English Academic Writing		
	A weekend course for academic faculty on English scientific writing for one semester in Fall 2010. An English Academic Writing Center since 2015.	An English Academic Writing Center since 2001

Coding: **C***: Compulsory* | **E***: Elective* | **1***: 1st year course* | **2***: 2nd year course* | **3 or 4***: 3rd or 4th year course*

In preparatory classes, where students are immersed in English for at least 20 hours a week for a full academic year before they start their undergraduate studies, it was found that academic writing is offered only in English in both universities. Yet, it is important to note that preparatory English education is compulsory for the 30% English (some programs at GAZI, such as economics and engineering) and 100% English-medium departments (all programs at METU) (HEC 2008).

During the first-year undergraduate studies, compulsory general English or English for Academic Purposes courses (EAP I & II) are also taught in both universities for two semesters. Again in the first year, English majors in English language teaching (ELT) programs are required to take an integrated Advanced Reading and Writing (ARW) course for three hours a week for two semesters. Likewise, in the first year of the undergraduate studies, a common compulsory Turkish or Turkish Composition class is offered to all students for two semesters in both universities. These first-year Turkish and English courses are similar at both universities, as these are required courses by the HEC for all departments in all universities in Turkey (HEC, 2008).

In upper-level courses at the undergraduate level, on the other hand, more differences are observed between the two universities as METU offers more

opportunities for academic writing, particularly in English, to a wider student population than GAZI. For example, in the second and third years, compulsory and elective courses targeting acquisition of English academic writing and research skills are available in METU for all programs. In addition, while the research methods courses are offered in Turkish for all majors including English majors in GAZI, the same courses are offered in English in METU. At the graduate level, several new graduate courses aimed at teaching advanced academic writing skills have been introduced in both universities. Moreover, there has been a recent increase in additional academic writing support in English, such as writing centers both in METU and GAZI and a weekend English scientific writing course in GAZI.

This significant increase in the variety of academic literacy courses at the graduate level and in the amount of additional support for English academic writing took place especially after 2000 when international publications in English became a prerequisite for academic promotion and started to be seen as the number one indicator of academic success in HEC's policies. This indicates that the macro-level state policies might have influenced the academic literacy-in-education planning and instruction in both universities. Yet, it is also important to note that while these opportunities all target English academic writing in METU, Turkish writing instruction has remained stable over the years.

Curriculum Policy

Time Allocated to Academic Literacy Education

Time is an important prerequisite for the development of academic writing skills, which involve complex linguistic, cognitive, and socio-cultural factors. Building academic writing skills requires a long time and intensive practice to be able to use the language accurately and appropriately; to employ skills and strategies related to the writing process such as generating ideas, drafting, organizing, revising, and editing; as well as to establish social skills such as developing awareness of writing conventions, genre-specific features, and audience expectations in a particular context. Acquisition of these skills in L2 entails even more time and practice, as it means socialization into a new discourse community that is likely to have different writing conventions and audience expectations. Therefore, the amount of writing instructional time is critical in any academic writing instruction, particularly L2 academic writing instruction.

When we look at the situation in Turkish universities, despite the variety of the writing courses and the rise in the number of new academic writing

opportunities in both universities, as listed in Table 2.1, a detailed examination reveals problems with class time devoted to academic writing in practice. First, it was found that some planning by both the HEC and universities resulted in the elimination of certain academic writing courses, which thus caused serious limitations in classroom hours. For example, as reported in the Department of History booklet, the first-year EAP I & II in METU, which is currently four hours a week for two semesters, used to be ten hours a week before the mid-1980s, but as the HEC increased the student quota, which brought about a serious shortage of instructors, the number of hours for these ten-credit Freshman English courses had to be decreased to four. Similarly, the first-year ARW I & II courses, which are offered for English majors in ELT programs, is currently three hours a week for two semesters (a total of six credit hours). However, from the interviews with the instructors, it was understood that these courses were introduced to the curriculum in 2006 by combining three separate academic literacy courses—Advanced Reading Skills and Advanced Writing Skills for two semesters, and a second-year Academic Writing course for a semester (a total of 15 credit hours)—into one. As the number of classes and class hours allocated to academic literacy was restricted, academic literacy-in-education for English majors was negatively affected. This indicates a contradiction with the HEC's own publishing policies, which, on the one hand, necessitate higher-order academic literacy skills for academic success and international publishing, and, on the other hand, decrease the number of academic writing courses and cut the class hours.

Second, it was found that writing is generally embedded in the preparatory and first-year general English or EAP courses but often neglected when compared to other language skills. The preparatory teachers in GAZI stated that, for the students who are not English majors, only around 10% of the total class hours (around one to two hours of the total 20-25 hours per week) are devoted to writing. All teachers said that writing is not given priority in their classes and it is often left behind other skills; therefore, students do not have enough opportunities to practice and produce effective academic papers. GAZI instructors said they lecture about writing one week and let the students write for one hour in class the next week. That is, the students may only write for one hour every two weeks. Some instructors also mentioned that the students are not motivated to write in English because they do not write, but instead they take tests, in future English courses. Because writing is not central in university education in general, reading, grammar, and vocabulary, which often appear in tests, are given the utmost priority in English classes. At METU, the situation seems a little better than it is in GAZI. For example, the instructors said that teaching writing is an essential part of the program

from the very beginning of the academic year because students are asked to write paragraphs in the preparatory class exit exam. The classes comprise around 20% writing (three to five hours of the total 15-25 hours of English course per week), and students not only learn about writing rules but also practice writing in class every week.

In the first-year English classes at METU, around one hour in a four-hour-a-week EAP class is allocated to writing. Instructors said they try to attend to all skills equally and spend time on writing in class every week, but by writing for one hour a week, their students can only achieve basic-level writing in English. The instructors at GAZI stated that English is three hours a week, but writing is almost non-existent in the first-year English classes, especially for students who have not attended the preparatory classes. In the second year, nonetheless, they said the situation becomes better as they can allocate 20-30% of the course hours to writing. In the first-year ARW course for English majors, METU instructors stated that they distribute course time equally between reading and writing, but GAZI instructors maintained that approximately 70% of the class time is devoted to reading, while writing sections in the book are often given as homework for students because they do not have time to deal with writing in class. All instructors at GAZI complained that the integrated reading/writing course is ineffective when compared to previous separate reading and writing courses, and they claimed that the integration of both meant that neither reading nor writing could be taught adequately. Overall, all instructors and most students stated that the integrated Academic Reading and Writing course does not allow them to learn and practice higher-level academic writing skills such as the development of logical argument, or writing well-organized, cohesive, and coherent paragraphs and essays, due to time constraints.

In the second-year Research Methods course, which is three hours a week in both universities, some writing instruction on research reporting is included in the syllabus; however, the time allocated to writing in these classes largely varies according to the instructor and departments. For example, while some students said they actually wrote a research paper and received feedback between drafts in the Research Methods course, other students said they never wrote a research paper, but only took tests on research methods. In METU, in the third year, there is an additional Advanced Writing and Research Skills course for three hours a week for English majors. All students stated that they found this course very helpful as instructors attend to each individual writing assignment and provide feedback both in and out of classroom time whenever needed. However, instructors claimed that the course hours are not adequate for providing a sufficient knowledge base about both research and

writing skills at the same time, and thus teachers have to make personal sacrifices such as arranging extra office hours to help students with their writing. One instructor said they need more time because students come to classes with no previous knowledge of academic writing and scientific thinking skills in Turkish, which could then be transferred to English.

Turkish Composition or Turkish I & II classes are only two hours a week for all programs for two semesters, and writing is only covered for one semester as part of a curriculum that includes not just writing but some content on language in general (see the next sections for a detailed description). Therefore, when compared to the academic English writing instruction especially in METU, Turkish writing instruction at the undergraduate level seems to fall short for developing students' Turkish academic writing skills.

The graduate courses are all three hours a week for either the fall or spring semester. While the general research methods courses have been offered for almost three decades, specific writing courses targeting academic writing, including thesis writing and writing for publishing purposes, have been more recently introduced to the curriculum in various departments, especially at GAZI. Moreover, some additional support for English writing in the form of writing centers has also been offered at both universities. The writing centers at METU and GAZI offer one-on-one tutorial sessions for 45 minutes to graduate students and academic faculty by appointment. According to the writing center director of METU, approximately 300-350 sessions are held in one semester to offer help with English academic writing. Because the writing center has just been opened at GAZI, such statistics are not yet available. At GAZI, a weekend course on English scientific writing was also offered in 2010 for three hours a week for eight weeks during the fall semester for graduate students, research assistants, and faculty.

Objectives of the Courses (Targeted Genres and the Levels of Writing)

In preparatory classes and the first-year English courses, English academic writing at the paragraph level and the essay level is offered. While EAP I mainly includes paragraph writing with just an introduction to essay writing, EAP II includes academic essay writing and incorporates a documented argumentative and a reaction-response essay in its syllabus. The ARW I & II courses for English majors at both universities also have a similar focus. While the former teaches mainly paragraph-level writing with an introduction to essay, the latter includes essay-level writing and an introduction to all types of essays.

While academic English writing practices were found to be limited to paragraph and sometimes to essay-level writing at the undergraduate level,

the situation for Turkish is worse, as almost no Turkish academic writing instruction exists. Although Turkish composition courses are given for two semesters, writing is only taught for one semester, as the other Turkish composition course focuses on oral presentation skills and Turkish speaking skills. Moreover, the greater part of these courses comprises units about language, culture, and grammar. Although language, culture, and grammar are topics all closely related to writing, these issues are presented as lectures in isolation, not combined with or integrated into writing instruction. Most students from various programs claimed that they have not written in these courses, but instead they only learned theoretical information through lectures about writing, including information about how to write in genres that were generally nonacademic, such as petitions, letters, tales, and poetry. Some students also asserted that their instructors mostly focused on Turkish grammar, spelling, and punctuation, rather than making them practice actual writing. This situation is likely to have dire consequences, especially for students of the Turkish-medium programs (mostly social sciences and humanities) at GAZI, as this means these students do not practice academic writing in either Turkish or English, while students in 30% English (hard sciences) at GAZI and 100% English programs at METU experience at least some form of academic writing in English at the undergraduate level.

As for the research courses, it was found that despite its existence in the syllabus, instruction on writing about or reporting on research comprises a small portion of the classes, and sometimes students even finish these courses without practicing any writing or submitting a research paper. Despite their variability, research methods courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels generally focus on basic research methods and techniques, such as statistical sampling procedures, writing hypotheses, controlling variables, data collection, data evaluation, test reliability/validity, and quantitative and qualitative research methods, including surveys, case studies, correlation studies, and statistical analysis with SPSS program. Thus, only a small part of these courses deals with writing issues such as plagiarism, reviewing the literature, and reporting the research results. Moreover, as stated by the instructors and students, only some of these courses at the undergraduate level require in-class writing or a written final project, and teacher feedback on drafts is often either limited or nonexistent. It was also found that in some classes, students only received theoretical instruction on writing and did not have any chance to write in or out of the class; instead, many students had multiple-choice or short-answer exams that asked them about research design and academic writing skills, such as statistical methods, referencing, or APA style.

A few elective courses at METU and GAZI (mostly for English majors)

were found to have a deeper focus on scientific academic writing; however, these courses do not have a large impact, as they are limited in number and student access. However, at the graduate level, some graduate courses and additional activities target longer and more scientific writing of research papers, theses and dissertations, and even scientific articles, in harmony with the goals of the state policies.

Materials and Methodology Policy

English and Turkish Instructional Materials

The analysis of materials in this part of the study demonstrates that English and Turkish academic writing textbooks and instruction differ in ways that are important to consider in relationship to how English and Turkish are valued in university courses and in scholarly publishing. Specifically, there are striking differences in the content and emphasis of textbooks (e.g., general versus academic) as well as in course assessment practices.

With respect to English academic writing, it was found that except for the books required in the first-year EAP I & II courses at METU, and ARW courses in the ELT programs at both universities, all books are written and published by western authors and publishers. For example, in the METU preparatory classes, *Lifelines* and *Q: Skills for Success* series by Oxford University Press, and the *Top Notch* series by Longman Pearson, with many supplementary books written by both foreign and Turkish authors, are used. In the preparatory classes at GAZI, *Speak Out* as well as some writing books, such as *Fundamentals of Academic Writing* and *Strategic Writing* by Pearson, and *Reading and Writing Unlock* by Cambridge, are required. Similarly, the first- and second-year general English courses at GAZI follow *English for Life* and the *Q: Skills for Success* series by Oxford University Press. In the writing component of these courses, the focus is on English writing rules regarding paragraph and essay writing such as deductive organization, cohesion, coherence, unity, thesis statements, and topic sentences (see also Rudd & Telafici, this volume, for an appraisal of English-language writing textbooks in Qatar).

Common locally produced books are also used in EAP I & II in METU and ARW courses in both universities. These books include all four language skills; yet, while all these skills are covered in EAP I & II, in ARW only the reading and writing parts are covered. The names of the books are *Academic Survival Skills I & II*, published by Black Swan (Ankara). These books are written by Turkish instructors working in the Modern Languages Department at METU and are published by a local publisher; however, these books follow Anglo-American conventions of academic discourse. For example, the

first book presents topics related to expository and reaction paragraph writing, as well as conventions regarding paragraph writing, such as: introducing explicit main ideas and topic sentences; supporting ideas; different patterns of organization (narration, description, process analysis, etc.); supporting techniques (e.g., examples & illustrations, data, facts, statistics, testimony, etc.); unity and coherence; and cohesive devices (with a list of transitions). In addition, the book provides an introduction to essay writing with rules regarding choosing and narrowing down a topic; making outlines; parallelism; coordination and subordination; formal writing style; hedging and tentativeness; introductory strategies; writing the body of the essay; conclusion strategies; unity and coherence; revising and editing strategies; writers' techniques and purposes for writing (to inform, to persuade, etc.); and considering audience, point of view, tone, register, and style.

The second book provides guidelines regarding how to write a research-based documented argumentative essay and a reaction-response essay. First, some knowledge base is introduced about basics of doing and writing research, such as identifying and selecting relevant sources; referencing and citing according to APA; borrowing ideas (summarizing, paraphrasing, direct quoting); plagiarism; and strategies of avoiding writer's block. Then conventions related to argumentation and argumentative writing are presented through various topics, such as writing an argumentative thesis; preparing a pro-con chart; refuting the counterarguments; outlining; unity and coherence; avoiding logical fallacies; analyzing and synthesizing opinions; and avoiding sexist language.

Turkish writing books have content that is quite different from the English academic writing books mentioned above. While English books are academically oriented, technical, detailed, and rule-based, Turkish writing books seem to have devoted considerable space to discussing more general issues about language, culture, civilizations, and history, rather than writing itself. In addition, a considerable part of the writing content focuses on genres of non-academic writing and creative writing. Writing instruction differs from English especially in terms of the emphasis given on certain writing topics addressed and the number of writing activities or exercises for practice. Moreover, although the writing rules seem to overlap with English at first sight, they are explained in a very general manner. Many specific details in global writing rules in English, such as cohesive markers, hedging, subordination, strategies related to the writing process, and paragraph structure (e.g., topic sentences) are either missing in the Turkish books or very superficially explained; instead, the focus seems to be more on sentence-level grammar rules and punctuation in writing.

For example, first it was found that some Turkish classes use no textbooks; yet, two textbooks were mentioned in the interviews for other Turkish classes. These were *Türkçenin sırları (The Mysteries of Turkish)* (Banarli,2013), which focuses only on Turkish language instruction (sentence-level grammar), and *Üniversiteler için Türkçe I Yazılı Anlatım (Turkish I: Written Composition for Universities)* (Yakici, Yucel, Dogan, & Savas, 2006). For the purposes of this research, the latter book on writing was analyzed. The first three units out of the six of the Yakici et al. (2006) textbook covers general topics, such as definitions of language, and the relationships between language and culture and culture and civilization. In the fourth unit, some theoretical knowledge about writing is introduced, such as topic selection; narrowing and development of the topic; the importance of words and sentences in composition; planning compositions; main ideas; use of imagination; types of expression (narration, description, definition, explanation, exemplification, persuasion, and comparison); point of view (creative writing and non-fiction opinion writing); textual analysis of written genres such as formal writing (petition, meeting or event records, meeting decision writing, report, job letter, CV, advertisement, memorandum, legal texts); creative writing (tale, fairy tale, poetry, short story, novel, drama); and opinion writing (article, criticism, essay, memoir, diary, travel writing, letter, interview, presentation). In the final unit, information about writing a bibliography, note taking and summarizing techniques are given. However, the focus then turns to sentence- and word-level language instruction rather than writing. For example, 25 Turkish grammar and spelling rules are explained one by one, and then common word- and sentence-level language problems and common mistakes in Turkish are listed under 27 categories, including wrong spelling; wrong use of apostrophe; parallelism; wrong use of idioms and proverbs; unnecessary verbs, and so on. These are followed by punctuation and abbreviation rules.

As understood from course syllabi, textbooks and interviews, one striking finding was that Turkish courses include and emphasize mostly non-academic genres that do not adequately address the academic writing needs of the students, as can be seen in the list of genres above. For example, while the book devotes 56 pages to creative writing such as fairy tales and writing poems, the essay is explained in a half page followed by some example essays, for a total of ten pages. Moreover, essay writing is explained in general terms mostly related to language style and personal voice when compared to English books, in which more specific and detailed rules on essay writing are given. Overall, creative writing, as well as some formal genres such as legal petitions and job letters, seem to be given priority over academic texts in Turkish classes. This suggests that some cultural factors may be at work, as suggested by contras-

tive rhetoric research that discusses differences in writing education across cultures (e.g., Kadar-Fulop, 1988; Li, 1996; Liebman, 1992; Liu, 2005; Uysal, 2008). Another reason for the difference might be the low importance given to writing in the higher education system in Turkey, as students reported they do not write much in Turkish composition classes or in their departmental courses, and instead often take short-answer or multiple-choice tests. Academic writing is not central to Turkish universities or in assessment procedures, which is reflected in academic writing education as well.

English L2 and Turkish L1 Teaching Approaches and Methods

There is considerable variation in teaching approaches and methods across English and Turkish language writing instruction at Turkish universities. In terms of teaching methods, scholars agree that learning L2 writing is an overwhelmingly difficult process involving very complicated factors; therefore, no single teaching approach will suffice (Blanton & Kroll, 2002). Instead, all approaches to second language instruction should be blended together as each of these reflects a valuable and indispensable part of the second-language writing construct (Silva, 1990). That is, the product approach focusing on lexical-syntactic features, controlled or guided composition focusing on discourse-level textual features; the process approach focusing on the underlying recursive and exploratory writing processes of the individual; the contrastive rhetoric approach focusing on the L1 cultural influences on writing; and the genre approach focusing on the social aspects of writing, such as writing according to the descriptors of various genres and expectations of audiences in specific contexts, should be used in a complementary manner. However, these approaches can be used selectively and some writing features may gain importance over others according to the purpose of the writing instruction. In the case of EAP classes and in any writing for publishing purposes, particularly for ESL/EFL students, product-oriented controlled or guided composition and genre approaches are often dominant. Thus, in academic ESL/EFL writing classes, the emphasis is often too much on the final product and the mastery of English academic writing conventions following strict models and formulas. Some scholars have expressed concern that this kind of instruction may lead to restriction in creativity inherent in writing (Hyland, 2003). Others have suggested that strictly following Anglo-American writing norms could result in assimilation into L2 cultural literacy or the elimination of individual voice and diversity in writing (Canagarajah, 1999; 2002; Kachru, Y. 1997). Instead, some recent critical approaches recommend the maintenance of individual and cultural voice by representing one's identity and code-mixing L1 rhetoric with English writing conventions even in

academic or scientific writing (Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Harwood & Hadley, 2004).

With these concerns and recommendations in mind, we note that Turkish university instructors employ a product-oriented methodology with a limited reflection of genre and process approaches as students are getting familiarized with the conventions of certain paragraph and essay types, and often students write one or two drafts before the final product in the preparatory, first- and second-year English, EAP, and ARW courses. Due to the time constraints, this first draft is often done at home and feedback is provided by the teachers on these texts in either written form or by showing the papers through an overhead projector or computer to the class and going over the problems in crowded classes. In ARW courses, an integrated reading-writing language teaching approach is also adopted. However, although this is a highly advocated approach to academic writing as it provides students with both content knowledge and familiarity with rhetorical structure and conventions (e.g., Canagarajah, 2002; Hyland, 2000), in the Turkish context, as reported by the instructors, this approach was not successfully implemented due to the restricted class hours (see also Miller & Pessoa this volume for related discussion of writing classes in U.S. universities in Qatar).

The third-year Writing Term Papers course at METU also uses foreign sources, which include the *APA Publication Manual* and *Writing the Research Paper: A Handbook* (Winkler & McCuen, 1999). On the other hand, the third-year Advanced Writing and Research Skills course at METU and the other research courses do not use a particular textbook but follow photocopied materials generally based on foreign sources. Besides research techniques and statistical knowledge, these courses have more in-depth content for research writing regarding APA style, quoting, summarizing, paraphrasing, and synthesizing, avoiding plagiarism, argument fallacies, citations, and referencing. In these classes, students receive one-on-one written and oral feedback in all steps of their writing of the research papers, and they write multiple drafts in and out of the classes thanks to personal efforts of the instructors. In the graduate writing courses at GAZI, again no specific textbook is used. The courses are based on lectures, readings, textual analysis of the targeted genres such as theses and dissertations (Academic Writing I & II), and research articles (e.g., the Academic Writing for Publishing Purposes course). Additionally, writing samples of academic writing are provided through a genre-based process approach, in which students are given feedback on their writing and are allowed to write multiple drafts after considering audience expectations and genre requirements.

As for the teaching approach for Turkish composition, the interviews re-

vealed that most of these courses' content is presented through lectures and oral presentations "teaching about writing," rather than practicing actual writing. Thus, writing is often not practiced in classes, and students are at best asked to write only in exams, reflecting a product approach. In Turkish textbooks, no tasks for actual writing practices are provided, which confirms the students' accounts. The parts of the textbook related to writing are organized by presenting a brief introduction to certain genres, which is followed by sample model texts.

Discussion and Conclusions

The increasing spread and dominance of English in global academia and research publishing is strongly evident in the Turkish context. English seems to have become a "lingua academica" (Phillipson, 2008) in Turkey because, besides functioning as the medium of instruction in more universities, it has also become the widely accepted language of science and research publications. The historical analysis of Turkish state policies demonstrates a continuous encouragement and even imposition of English as the language of science and research publishing as a means to integrate with Europe and the global scientific world. Accordingly, Anglo-American academic values of "publish or perish" seem to be adopted through a shift of focus from teaching to research and from national to international publications in English. The consequences of the state policies are most obvious in the steep increase in the number of publications in the ISI database, which has become an important indicator of one's academic success.

The reflections of the state policies are also manifested in micro-level literacy-in-education practices, as more courses aiming to develop English academic writing skills and additional support through writing centers started to be offered at universities, while academic writing in Turkish is extremely neglected. With such a weak infrastructure of Turkish academic literacy instruction, English is likely to gain an even higher status and hegemony in scientific literacy in the near future. As a result, given the dominance of English in Turkish academia through both top-down government policies and literacy-in-education practices, more planning and policy is needed to preserve a place for Turkish in the academic domain and in academic writing instruction.

In addition, English academic writing and research courses, whether they use local or foreign sources, mainly promote Anglo-American writing norms, logic, and research traditions; this promotion points to the diffusion of a powerful cultural rhetoric through academic instruction in the Turkish con-

text, which is similar to other contexts as suggested by Canagarajah (1999). Although effective instruction in English rhetorical and scientific conventions is needed for participation in the Anglo-centric discourse community, more critical pedagogical approaches have recently been suggested. These approaches involve awareness-raising about the complexities and socio-political issues surrounding English academic writing, and code-mixing with L1 writing for rhetorical creativity and diversity instead of rhetorical homogeneity (Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Harwood & Hadley, 2004). Yet, these recent trends have not made their way into academic literacy instruction in Turkish universities.

At the same time, it should be noted that English academic writing instruction also seems to suffer from various problems, such as inadequate class hours and product-oriented teaching approaches in both universities. For example, the number and classroom hours of some English and English academic writing courses decreased over the years, which contradicts macro-level state policies. For that reason, writing cannot be practiced much in classes, and students do not write multiple drafts and receive feedback from teachers or peers between drafts. In addition, writing in English does not go beyond essay writing, and it is often neglected among other language skills.

Moreover, considering the general characteristics of the Turkish educational system and academic culture at the tertiary level, in which students are given lectures and assessed through tests instead of being assigned papers or portfolios, writing is often not central and not practiced in other departmental courses. Therefore, these limited literacy-in-education practices in both English and Turkish seem to fall short in preparing future academics to publish in prestigious international journals and to compete in the global scientific world. Hence, attempts should be made both to increase the classroom hours and quality of academic writing instruction in both Turkish and English in future planning and practice.[2]

Notes

1. National language planning is possible because education in Turkey is highly centralized. While primary and secondary education is under the responsibility of Ministry of National Education, tertiary education is supervised and coordinated by the Higher Education Council.
2. This research is part of a larger project about the effects of Turkish state publishing policies on: 1. Turkish scholars' publishing behaviors in Turkish vs. English (Uysal, 2014a); 2. University practices of research, publishing, and promotion (Uysal, 2014b); and 3. Academic writing instruction. This chapter reports on the third part of the research on writing instruction at Turkish uni-

versities. This research was supported by Gazi University Individual Research Grant (BAP) 04/2012-26.

References

Ak, M. Z., & Gülmez A. (2006). The analysis of international publication performance of Turkey. *Akademik Incelemeler [Academic Investigations], 1*(1), 25-43.

Akarsu, F. (2000). Transition and education: A case study of the process of change in Turkey. In K. Mazurek, M. Winzer, & C. Majorek (Eds.), *Education in a global society: A comparative perspective* (pp. 315-329). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Akıllı, E., Büyükçınar, Ö., Latif, V., Yetgin, S., Gürses, E. A., Saraç, C., & Demirel, İ. H. (2009). *Türkiye Bilimsel Yayın Göstergeleri II 1981–2007 Türkiye* Ülkeler *Gruplar [The publication indicators of Turkey (II) 1981–2007, Turkey, Countries, Groups.]* Ankara: TUBITAK.

Alptekin, C. (1998). Learning a foreign language does not mean losing Turkish. In A. Kilimci (Ed.), *Anadilinde cocuk olmak: Yabanci dilde egitim [Being a child speaking in the mother-tongue: Education through foreign languages]* (pp. 34-37). Ankara: Papirüs Publications.

Ardınç, F. N. (2007). Türkçe yayın ve akademik yükseltme kriterleri [Turkish publications and academic promotion criteria]. In O. Yilmaz (Ed.), *Sağlık Bilimlerinde Süreli Yayıncılık* (pp. 35-38). Ankara: Tubitak-Ulakbim.

Arıoğlu, E., & Girgin, C. (2002). 1974-2001 döneminde ülkemizde bilimsel yayın performansının kısa değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of scientific publication performance of Turkey between 1974-2001]. *Science & Utopia Journal, 95, 62-66.*

Arıoğlu, E., & Girgin, C. (2003). Ülkemizin yayın sıralamasına eleştirel bir bakış [A critical look at the publication rankings of Turkey]. *Science & Utopia Journal, 105,* 38-41.

Ayyıldız, M., & Bozkurt, Ü. (2006). Edebiyat ve kompozisyon eğitiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar [The problems faced in literature and composition education]. *Turkish Education Sciences Journal*, *4*(1), 45-52.

Baldauf, R. B. (2005). Language planning and policy research: An overview. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 957-970). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Banarli, S. (2013). *Türkçenin sırları*. İstanbul: Kubbealtı Nesrıyat.

Bear, J. (1998). Yabanci dilde egitim [Education in foreign languages]. In A. Kilimci (Ed.), *Anadilinde çocuk olmak: Yabanci dilde egitim [Being a child speaking in the mother-tongue: Education through foreign languages]* (pp. 73-76). Ankara: Papirüs Publications.

Blanton, L. L., & Kroll, B. (Eds.). (2002). *ESL composition tales: Reflections on teaching.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006a). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26,* 197-218.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006b). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4), 586-619.

Cohen, D., & Crabtree, B. (2006). *Qualitative research guidelines project.* Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Mulitilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(3), 663-688.

Demircan, Ö. (1988). *Dünden bugüne Türkiye'de yabancı dil [Foreign languages in Turkey from past to present].* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi

Demircan, Ö. (1995). Yabancı öğretim diliyle nereye? [Where to go with foreign language as the medium of education?]. *Ögretmen Dünyası, 182*, 19-20.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (1995). An evaluation of the Turkish language reform after 60 years. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 19*(3), 221-249.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19*(1), 24-39.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S., & Kiziltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes, 24*(2), 253-265.

Ergenç, I. (2001). Bilim dili ve ana dil (Language of science and the mother tongue). *Bilim ve Ütopya, 80*, 12-13.

Eurydice. (2010). Organization of the education system, Turkey 2009-2010. Retrieved from http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/60E61005D5CC5AD-1C1257AA30025212F/$file/Organization%20of%20the%20education%20system%20in%20Turkey%202009.2010.pdf

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 243-264.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative English speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 127-150.

Göçer, A. (2010). Writing education in Turkish education. *The Journal of International Social Research, 3*(12), 178-195.

Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 23,* 355-377.

HEC-The Higher Education Council. (2008). The regulation on the conditions of teaching foreign languages and English-medium education in tertiary education. *Official Gazette* No: 27074. Retrieved from http://www.yok.gov.tr/

HEC. (2010). *The Higher Education System in Turkey.* Bilkent, Ankara. Retrieved from http://www.yok.gov.tr

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language Writing.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

IUC-Inter-university Council. (2000). Doçentlik sınav yönetmeliği. [Regulation for the associate professorship exam]. *Resmi Gazette*, No. 24157.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 355-365). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, Y. (1995). Contrastive rhetoric in World Englishes. *English Today, 41*, 21-31.

Kachru, Y. (1997). Cultural meaning and contrastive rhetoric in English education. *World Englishes, 16,* 227-350.

Kadar-Fulop, J. (1988). Culture, writing, and curriculum. In Purves, (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 25-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kaplan, R. B. (2001). The dominance of English as a lingua of science: Effects on other languages and language communities. In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a lingua of science: Effects on other languages and language communities* (pp. 3-26). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language Planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf. R. B. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013-1034). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kılıçkaya, F. (2006). Instructors' attitudes towards English-medium instruction in Turkey. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, *8*(6), 1-16.

Kılınç, A. (2001). YÖK bilimde Türkçeye karşı mı? [Is HEC against Turkish in science?] Retrieved from http://mimoza.marmara.edu.tr/~avni/dersbelgeligi/dil/Ahmetkilinc.htm

Kinzer, S. (2001). *Crescent and star: Turkey between two worlds*. New York: Farrar, Straus &Giroux.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English-medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 1*(1), 101-123.

Köksal, A. (2002). *Yabancı dilde* öğretim: *Türkiye'nin en büyük yanılgısı [Education in foreign languages: Turkey's biggest mistake].* Ankara: Ögretmen Dünyası.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Li, X. M. (1996). "*Good writing" in cross-cultural context*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Liebman, J. (1992). Toward a new contrastive rhetoric: Differences between Arabic and Japanese rhetorical instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1,* 141-165.

Lillis, T., & Curry, J. M. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context.* London: Routledge.

Liu, L. (2005). Rhetorical education through writing instruction across cultures: A comparative analysis of select online instructional materials on argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(1), 1-18.

Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

ÖSYM. (2011). *Student selection and placement examination list of preferences book.*

Ankara: YÖK.
Pazarlıoğlu, M. V., & Özkoç, H. (2009). The econometric analysis of international publications of Turkey between 1983-2004. *Sosyal Bilimler, 7*(2), 45-58.
Phillipson, R. (2006). English, a cuckoo in the European higher education nest of languages? *European Journal of English Studies, 10*(1), 13-32.
Phillipson, R. (2008). Lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalization. *World Englishes, 27*(2), 250-267.
Ramanathan, V. (2005). The English-Vernacular divide: Postcolonial language politics and practice. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System, 36,* 156-171.
Sinanoğlu, O. (2002). *Bye-Bye Türkçe.* Ankara: Otopsi Publications.
Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Swales, J. (1997). English as tyrannosaurus rex. *World Englishes, 16*(3), 373-382.
Tardy, C. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: Lingua franca or Tyrannosaurus rex? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3,* 247-269.
Tok, H., & Arıbaş, S. (2008). Teaching foreign languages during adaptation process to European Union. *Inönü University Education Faculty Journal, 9*(15), 205-227.
TUBITAK-ULAKBIM. (2011). *Turkish Publication Statistics*. Retrieved from http://www.tubitak.gov.tr/tubitak_content_files/english/sti/statistics/TR_STI60.pdf
UNDP-United Nations Development Program Reports. (2009). Retrieved from http://data.un.org/Search.aspx?q=literacy+rate+turkey
Uysal, H. H. (2008). Tracing the culture behind writing: Rhetorical patterns and bidirectional transfer in L1 and L2 essays of Turkish writers in relation to educational context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(3), 183-207.
Uysal, H. H. (2014a). English language spread in academia: Macro-level state policies and micro-level practices of scholarly publishing in Turkey. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 38*(3),
Uysal, H. H. (2014b). Turkish academic culture in transition: Centre-based state policies and semi-peripheral practices of research, publishing, and promotion. In K. Bennett (Ed.), *The Semi-periphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities, and practices* (pp. 165-189). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Uysal, H. H., Plakans, L., & Dembovskaya, S. (2007). English spread in local contexts: Turkey, Latvia, and France. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 8*(2), 192-207.
Winkler, A. & McCuen J. K. (1999). *Writing the research paper: A handbook*. Boston: Cengage.
Yakici, A., Yucel, M., Dogan, M., Savas, Y. (2006). *Üniversiteler için Türkçe I Yazılı Anlatım (Turkish I: Written Composition for Universities)* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi

Appendix 1: Interview Questions

Instructors

1. How many hours of ---- class do you teach per week?
2. How much of your classes do you award to teaching and actual practicing of academic writing?
3. What writing genres and types do you cover in your classes?
4. What is the level of writing done? Do you practice writing academic essays or research papers?
5. What are the specific objectives of your course? For example, what writing features do you teach and emphasize in classes?
6. What textbooks do you use in your classes?
7. What are the main approaches and methods you employ while teaching writing?

Students

1. How much actual writing practice did you do in ---- class?
2. What kind of writing did you do in that class? (For example, essay, letter . . .)
3. What levels of writing did you do? For example, did you write paragraphs, essays, research papers . . .?
4. What were the goals of that class? For example, what specific rules for writing did you learn in --- class?
5. Which textbooks did you use in ---- class?
6. How did the teacher teach writing in ---- class?